

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner has rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite.

By the above amendment, Applicant has replaced the phrase "may be" with the phrase "is adapted to be".

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Richardson (Patent Number 3,552,893). However, the specification of the cited reference does not teach a lubrication path through the motor. As discussed in paragraphs [0031] and [0032] of the Applicant's specification, the Applicant's invention provides for a lubrication path that is parallel to the main fluid path. This lubrication path "insures effective lubrication of all four of the spline connections".

Therefore, by the above amendment, the elements of dependent claim 9 have been included in claim 1 and dependent claim 9 has been canceled. In view of the above amendment of independent claim 1, Applicant's attorney believes that the rejection under 102(b) has been overcome, and should be withdrawn.

In summary, Applicant has amended claim 2 to overcome the 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph rejection, and has amended claim 1 and canceled claim 9 to overcome the 35 U.S.C. 112(b) rejection. Applicant believes that the case is now in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



L. J. Kasper

Registration No.: 26,749

Attorney for Applicant

Eaton Corporation
1111 Superior Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2584

(216) 523-4138